REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 21 has been added. Claim 1, 5-7, 9-13, 20 and 21 are pending and under consideration.

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-13, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,278,977 to Agrawal et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,495 to Steinman.

In Agrawal et al., business models or process models are simplified to the effect that a re-ordering of activities is obtained on the basis of differences between parallel-processable and serial-processable activities and on the basis of time conditions. Specifically, according to Agrawal et al., a first step determines, based on the current-process-model from the audit-trail-records with identical process-model-instance-identifications, activities, which are processed sequentially being recorded with non-overlapping execution-intervals, and activities, which are in processed in parallel being recorded with overlapping execution-intervals.

In Agrawal et al. a second step adapts said current-process-model to generate a next-process-model by re-ordering those activities, allowed to be processed in parallel according to the current-process-model but actually having been executed sequentially only, as determined in said first step, into sequential execution order based on the time order of said execution-intervals. See claim 1.

According to Steinman, superfluous changes of state are avoided in a simulation by the fact that the event-objects produced by parallel nodes get time stamps and the earliest time stamp are read. Specifically, Steinman discloses a synchronous parallel system for emulation and discrete event simulation having parallel nodes. The system responds to received messages at each node by generating event objects having individual time stamps, stores only the changes to the state variables of the simulation object attributable to the event object and produces corresponding messages. The system refrains from transmitting the messages and changing the state variables while it determines whether the changes are superseded, and then stores the unchanged state variables in the event object for later restoral to the simulation object if called for. See abstract.

According to the invention, the process model itself is not changed. The invention seeks only components that are in connection to a selected unit. These components are represented as immediate surroundings of the selected unit in order to achieve an understandable representation. New independent claim 21 has been added to clarify this feature. Antecedent basis for new independent claim 21 can be found from a comparison of Figs. 1 and 2 of the

Serial No. 09/889,666

application and from paragraphs 32, 33, 36 and 37, for example of the application. According to new independent claim 21, the first event and the connections are displayed without displaying any relationship unless the relationship is defined by a first or second connection. Comparing Figs. 1 and 2 of the application, Fig. 1 is somewhat complicated. If a user is only interested in activity 101, it is difficult for the user to determine relationships with activity 101. For example, paragraph 32 describes that the origin of the arrows shown in Fig. 1 are not included in this portion of Fig. 1. On the other hand, Fig. 2 is easy for a user to understand. It shows activity 101 and only the events and relationships with which the user is concerned.

Neither Agrawal et al. nor Steinman disclose or suggest the invention, as claimed. Accordingly, the prior art rejection should be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 17 2006

By: Mark J. Henry
Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being trans-
mitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on _____ July 17 _____, 20_06_
STAAS & HALSEY
By: _____ N. Celler
Date _____ July 17, 06